

History of Parking Lot Items

Waste 2 Resources Advisory Committee

A list of “parking lot” issues was identified for potential “Next Steps.” Parking lot items were raised by the group that facilitators thought warranted further discussion, but outside of the WRRLCA 30% process.

- Discuss limiting funding to only products that pay into WRRLCA.
- Possible subcommittees or further discussion with W2RAC in 2013:
 - 1-800 recycling hotline “reboot.”
 - School awards “reboot.”
 - State and local plan update timelines.
 - Green building tools.
 - Solid waste laws update.
 - Gaps in activities.
 - Product-specific programs.
 - Packaging.

From July 2012 meeting notes: No ongoing parking lot items (Just more budget info that was provided in August).

From September 2012 meeting notes:

Limiting WRRLCA for taxed items

Suellen Mele asked to add an item to the “parking lot” list. Will there be time at the next meeting to look at the WRRLCA 30 percent and what it should fund? She disagrees that it should only be used for taxed items. Or maybe we don’t have to discuss, but just accept there are different opinions.

1-800 Recycle Hotline

Sego Jackson – Favors, but this activity needs further discussion. We should look at “rebooting.”

Vicki Christophersen – Favors and echoed Sego Jackson’s comments. She would be willing to put together a small group to look at revamping the activity and how it should be funded.

A “parking lot” issue was added to the list: Discuss a potential committee to look at a 1-800-Recycle Hotline “reboot.”

School recycling awards

Sego Jackson – Favors, with reboot or further discussion. *While the notes do not say this, it was suggested to add this to the parking lot list. Given the preceding discussion on a reboot for the hotline, it was assumed this reboot would also warrant additional work by the group.*

C&D / Green building

Sego Jackson - Thinks Ecology should look at the different tools that are out there to help support this work (LEED, Green Halo). There are great opportunities that have been squandered by cheaters.

Planning

Vicki Christophersen wonders if updating the state solid waste plan every five years is too often. Should we ask the Legislature to change that? Suellen Mele commented that solid waste planning is critical. Regular course corrections are important . . . We should keep doing the five-year updates, but look at a process to reduce the time spent.

Dennis Durbin added an item to the “parking lot” list: Talk about increased time between updates to state and local solid waste plans. Vicki Christophersen wonders if there’s a way to streamline solid waste planning. We should get input from local governments on what it costs.

Laws Update

Sego Jackson - He asked about the time period on the laws update. It might not be a priority for the next two years.

Overall Parking Lot Summary

Jane Dewell said it sounds like some subcommittees would be useful (“parking lot” item).
“Parking Lot” Items Summary:

- Broader discussion on WRRLCA 30 percent funding categories/activities.
- Talk about increased time between updates to state and local solid waste plans.
- Subcommittees to work on various issues, e.g. look at 1-800-Recycle Hotline, school awards, streamlining solid waste planning, and green building.

From November 2012 meeting notes:

School awards, hotline, and information clearinghouse reboot comments

Sego Jackson said he would hate for anyone to take out of this meeting that education in schools isn’t important. The school awards activity just needs a reboot (parking lot issue).

Laurie Davies said she thinks the Information Clearinghouse is a good tool, if done the right way.

Suellen Mele said she would interpret the 1-800-Recycle Hotline the same way. She knew it had E-cycle funding so she didn't vote much for it. Laurie Davies mentioned the hotline uses primarily E-Cycle funding because the majority of calls we get are for that activity.

Jan Gee echoed support for the 1-800-Recycle Hotline and school awards. She talked about the importance of educating youth and doing consumer education.

Jane Dewell said even though some activities got fewer votes, it doesn't mean they aren't up for future discussion.

WRRLCA tax and C&D/ green building issues comments

Jan Gee said the vast majority of building materials are not taxed under WRRLCA, so she has very strong feelings that WRRLCA should not fund those recycling programs. There should be another source of funding, or proposals to tax building materials should go to the Legislature.

Suellen Mele said she struggles with the fact that the program's C&D activities have no direct funding. If Ecology doesn't fund the activity as it historically has, it will be unfunded. Rick Hlavka agreed that many activities cannot generate their own funding.

Jan Gee mentioned that some activities are broader and include taxed products.

Jane Dewell asked if this issue should be addressed by a subcommittee. Laurie Davies said we need to have policy discussions about the overarching purpose of the account and what it should and shouldn't fund, rather than see decisions made in the back end of a budget.

Product specific programs / packaging comments

Jan Gee doesn't interpret product specific programs as product stewardship. She opposes any product stewardship that isn't a toxic product.

Sego Jackson was thinking product stewardship is one tool for product specific work. Packaging and product stewardship are difficult to separate. Almost all that goes into the garbage is a product or package at some point.

Vicki Christophersen said product stewardship activities should not be included in the WRRLCA 30 percent funding – only "hands on the ground" activities such as helping local governments increase recycling.

Art Starry made a suggestion that it would be helpful in the final report on this effort to include assumptions and interpretation, e.g. knowing how we interpret the term "product specific programs."

Vicki Christophersen asked if "packaging" means product stewardship.

Matt Henry said he's more interested in after activities are funded, and how the committee will be engaged in them. He assumes most items will get funding, but there are opinions on both sides. How will the group be engaged to provide input? He suggested a subcommittee on product specific programs and packaging.

Laurie Davies agreed there isn't enough definition of some like product specific programs, but the group should define this in its next steps.